24. The method of claim 22 further comprising:

accepting, via the user input device, at least one input selecting a second document stored in data storage; and

displaying on the screen an image of the second document.

REMARKS

Claims 6-27 remain pending, and presently stand rejected under 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griggs (U.S. Patent No. 4,435,617) in view of Buchanan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5, 1148,366).

MPEP 2142 states that in order for a *prima facie* case of obviousness to be established three basic criteria must be met, one of which is that the reference or combinations of references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant submits that the combination of Griggs and Buchanan et al. lacks the teaching of at least several of the claim limitations in independent claims 6, 13 and 22.

Specifically, for example, the Office Action states (respecting claim 6) that Griggs discloses the limitation "stores data representative at least one document relating to the transcription proceeding (see Fig. 1, item 36)." However, item 36 in Fig. 1 of Griggs refers to a printer/display, which is not discussed in the Griggs specification except for its mere mention at column 3, line 64. Therefore, the rejection should fail on this ground alone.

Even assuming this reference in Griggs is considered to be sufficient as representing the disclosure of data storage, such storage could only be of the document being transcribed. There is no discussion or suggestion in Griggs whatsoever of storage of at least one document *related to* the transcription or the display of that at least one document, as claimed by Applicant. Griggs therefore deals with only a single document that is being created.

Moreover, Buchanan et al. does not make up for this deficiency in Griggs. Buchanan et al. discloses a document generation system that uses "boiler plate" for enhancing or replacing the dictation and transcription process (such as disclosed in Griggs) for the creation of a document. Buchanan et al. does not disclose or suggest storage of at least one document *related to* the document being generated or the display of that at least one document, as

claimed by Applicant. Buchanan et al. therefore also only deals with a single document that is being created.

Thus the combination of Griggs and Buchanan et al. both only deal with a single document that is being created, and do not disclose or suggest the storage and display of a document that is related to the document being created.

In contrast, Applicants' claims are generally directed to at least two different documents, namely, the transcript text (i.e., the document being created) *and* at least one document related to the transcription proceeding (and thus related to the transcript text). Nevertheless, to clarify, Applicant has amended claims 6, 13, 22 and 24 to recite data storage that stores data representative of *an image of* at least one document and display of *the image of* the at least one document. Applicant attaches hereto as Appendix A, copies of the claims showing the amendments made by Applicant.

As an illustrative example, Applicant's claimed invention enables an attorney or judge, for example, to view an image of a document that has been entered into evidence as an exhibit, for example, as well as testimony (i.e., transcript text) from a witness who is testifying about the exhibit while the testimony is being taken, on a screen. The combination of Griggs and Buchanan et al. does not disclose or even suggest this capability.

With regard to Applicant's independent claims 13 and 22, Applicant submits that claims 13 and 22 have the same or similar limitations discussed above with respect to independent claim 6. Accordingly, the arguments above with respect to independent claim 6 are equally applicable with respect to claims 13 and 22. In addition, claims 7-12, 14-21 and 23-27 depend from claims 6, 13 and 22, respectively, and also include the limitations discussed above. Therefore, based on the above amendments and arguments, Applicant believes that the rejection of all claims 6-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the combination of Griggs and Buchanan et al. has been overcome.

In view of the more than one year that has passed since Applicant paid the issue fee in this case, Applicant respectfully requests that the present case be allowed and passed back to publications in an expedited manner. Should the Examiner disagree that the claims are allowable or believe that any issues remain unresolved, Applicant respectfully requests a phone interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor.

A Supplemental Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited. Please direct all telephone inquiries to the undersigned at (312) 707-8889.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2001

By: _____
Christopher C. Winslade
Reg. No. 36,308

Correspondence address:

James Buch
Engage Incorporated
1302 E. Forest Avenue
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

APPENDIX A

6. A transcription system used to convert words spoken during a transcription proceeding to a textual form for real time display, the transcription system comprising:

a transcriber that produces, in real time, transcript text representative of spoken words;

data storage that stores data representative of an image of at least one document relating to the transcription proceeding;

a user input device supporting the selection of the at least one document and;

a screen that displays the transcript text as it is produced and the image of the at least one document for viewing.

13. A transcription system used to convert words spoken during a transcription proceeding to a textual form for real time display, the transcription system comprising:

a transcriber that produces, in real time, transcript text representative of spoken words;

a communication link;

data storage that stores data representative of an image of at least one document relating to the transcription proceeding;

a screen;

a processor that receives the transcript text in real time from the transcriber via the communication link; and

the processor, as the transcriber produces the transcript text, directing display on the screen of the transcript text and the image of the at least one document for viewing.

22. A method used during a transcription proceeding for viewing transcript text and an image of at least one document, the method utilizing at least a stenographic system, a screen, data storage, and a user input device, the method comprising[;]:

converting, using the stenographic system, representations of spoken words to transcript text in real time;

displaying the transcript text on the screen for real time viewing;

accepting, via the user input device, at least one input selecting a first document stored in data storage; and

displaying on the screen [the] an image of the first document.

24. The method of claim 22 further comprising[;]:

accepting, via the user input device, at least one input selecting a second document stored in data storage; and

displaying on the screen an image of the second document.